



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MISCELLANY.

Rehearings.—In the following case, a petition for rehearing has been granted: *Chesapeake & O. R. Co. v. Ruckman*, 76 S. E. 278 Granted Jan. 16, 1913.

Damages for Having to Go to a Wedding in a Street Car.—In a recent Alabama case (*Browning v. Fies*, 58 South. 931) one Browning, who was about to be married, went to a livery stable and entered into a contract to furnish him, for the use of himself, friends and family, a carriage and team which was to be sent to his residence that evening to carry himself and his wedding party to the church where Browning was to be married. The charge was \$5, which amount he paid, and informed the livery stable keeper of the purpose for which the carriage was to be used and the hour appointed for the ceremony. But the carriage did not come. "The plaintiff, on account of the defendants' breach of the contract, was compelled, in order to reach the church where his prospective bride and friends were awaiting his coming, to resort to a public street car, in which plaintiff and his family and friends, at the expenditure of 30 cents for street car fare, attended the wedding appareled in 'dress' or 'evening' clothes. The plaintiff and the lady members of his family, unsuitably attired for riding in a street car and for walking along the public streets, had to walk for several squares from the place necessary to leave the car line in going to the church, and the wedding ceremony was delayed for 45 to 50 minutes on account of the failure of the plaintiff to reach the church on time. During this period of delay, the bride, family, minister, and friends in attendance at the church were kept waiting upon the delayed arrival of the prospective groom." The jury in an action against the livery stable keeper were instructed by the court that they could only give the plaintiff the actual damage he suffered, viz., \$5.30 and interest. But on appeal the judgment is reversed, the Supreme Court holding that he is entitled to recover for physical discomfort in consequence of being delayed and not having proper conveyance to meet the appointment, and for mental anguish suffered in consequence of the physical inconvenience and delay.—*American Law Review*.

Untrue Confessions.—A news item states that Nelson McManus, who mysteriously disappeared from his home near Jena, Louisiana, last fall, and was believed to be dead because of the alleged confession of Leland Walker to a detective that he murdered McManus by hitting him on the head with an ax, returned to his home after an absence of three months and a half. McManus declared he left home because of being heavily involved in debt, which he supposed

deranged his mind. His return released Leland Walker from suspicion. McManus says he cannot understand why Walker should have confessed he murdered him.

"There is something to wonder at under the sun," says the Cleveland Plain Dealer, "and there is a thing at which the children of men should stand in awe. It is this,—that a man should confess to the commission of a crime in which he has had no part. True it is that under the grilling methods of what is called 'the third degree,' many break down and say anything, in order to purchase respite from mental and physical torture. So did many a poor innocent wretch in the days when rack and thumbscrew and boots and the wheel threatened them with torture. It is easier to hang than to burn; the electric chair may at times seem more merciful than the inner office. These things are human, and natural.

"But what can one deduce from the false confession of a man who is not under pressure? Not coerced, not driven by any conceivable conscience, he exhibits himself as one of the anomalies of civilized communities. It is not rarely, it is surprisingly often, that an unaccused person comes forth and brands himself with the guilt of a crime he never committed.

"A man named Seth Nichols lately gave a circumstantial account of the manner in which he slaughtered Dr. Knabe, the Indianapolis woman physician. Investigation shows that he could not have done this murder. He himself, allowed time to think things over, repudiates his 'confession.' He is confined in a county jail whence anybody with the money or the influence can bail him. Why did Seth Nichols go to so much trouble to accuse himself of a crime that could easily have brought him to the gallows? It will not do to answer, 'He may be guilty.' It will not do to say, 'He's crazy.' It appears that he is neither; what's the psychology of this thing?"

Perhaps the best scientific explanation of the mysterious subject of untrue confessions by persons unjustly accused of capital crimes or who become erroneously impressed with the idea that they have committed them is that contained in a paper read by Dr. T. J. Hudson a few years since, before the Medico-Legal Society. The following fundamental principles present a summary of his article:

1. The dread of impending death will cause certain persons to enter, spontaneously, the subjective condition.

2. In the subjective condition the subject is constantly amenable to control by the power of suggestion.

3. A strong suggestion, vigorously enforced by a dominant personality upon a person in the subjective condition, will cause the latter to believe in its absolute verity, and to act upon it in all essentials as though it were true, even though the suggestion be contrary to fact, reason, experience, and the evidence of the senses.

4. Finally, the proposition that works back to the foregoing and

invests it with perennial importance to courts of criminal justice is that—assuming the constancy of nature—whatever power, faculty, or limitation belongs to any one individual must exist potentially in every member of the human family.—Case and Comment.

IN VACATION.

Squelching the Man.—It was at a suffragette meeting. A woman was speaking bitterly of the many rights and privileges which men enjoyed but which were so unjustly denied to the women.

"Say," broke in a male hearer, tauntingly, in a small, high-pitched voice that sounded well in proportion to his physical make-up, "wouldn't you like to be a man?"

"Yes," replied the woman, "wouldn't you?"—Harper's Monthly Magazine.

Boomerang for the Lawyer.—A lawyer tells a story of a young attorney who was cross-examining a boy of 15, and asked him:

"Have you any occupation?"

"Nope."

"What does your father do?"

"The old man? Oh, he don't do much."

"Doesn't he do anything to help keep the family?"

"Sometimes, but generally he's too strong to work."

"Ah!" The young attorney smiled. "As a matter of fact your father is a lazy loafer like yourself."

"Mebbe, he is, mebbe he ain't. Anyway you can ask him yourself. He's sittin' there on the jury."—Newark Morning Star.

He Was No Lawyer.—Uncle Mose, needing money, sold his pig to the wealthy Northern lawyer who had just bought the neighboring plantation. After a time, needing more money, he stole the pig and resold it, this time to Judge Pickens, who lived "down the road a piece." Soon afterward the two gentlemen met and, upon comparing notes, suspected what had happened. They confronted Uncle Mose. The old darky cheerfully admitted his guilt.

"Well," demanded Judge Pickens, "what are you going to do about it?"

"Blessed ef I know, Jedge," replied Uncle Mose with a broad grin. "I'se no lawyer. I reckon I'll have to let yo' two gen'men settle it between yo' selves."—Oklahoma Law Journal.